US Army Corps of Engineers

HEADQUARTERS
DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL WORKS AND
DIRECTORATE OF MILITARY PROGRAMS

PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT NEWS

VOLUME II ISSUE 1 MAY / JUNE 1999

This Publication Is Issued On A Bi-Monthly Basis.

STEVE'S NOTE

Dear Colleagues,

In an effort to further the Chief of Engineer's priority of "well integrated programs and staffs" and following the excellent example of Carl Enson and Dwight Beranek with their combined E&C Newsletter, Fred Caver and I decided to develop a single Civil Works/Military Programs PM newsletter. This is the first issue. We trust you will find these articles interesting and useful, and that you will share them with others on your project delivery teams. We'd appreciate your feedback and, even more, would welcome your contributions to future newsletters.

Stephen Browning, P.E.
Chief, Programs Management Division
Directorate of Military Programs §

FRED'S NOTE

The article that follows is a letter one of our District Commanders sent to his staff recently. The Commander gave us permission to publish his letter. I found it to be thought provoking and right on the money. We share it with you and hope that it causes you to think about why we need to change. I've heard people say there is no compelling reason to change to the new Project Management Business Process. I believe the letter makes the case very well.

Fred Caver
Chief, Programs Management Division
Directorate of Civil Works §

IN THIS ISSUE

THE CHALLENGES FACING THE ENTIRE CORPS TODAY

A District Commander's Open Letter

After hearing some of the negative thoughts and feelings that are floating around, a discussion concerning the challenges we face in the Corps today needs to be discussed. There are a lot of people who are still not convinced that there is a need for the business changes we are making. Many of you think things are fine and that we don't need to make any changes. If you're one of those people who still don't think we need to make major changes, let me spell it out for you.

The old system which we have been using for many years does not work any more. It may have been fine when we had captive customers, but it is not working today. We have had a declining military workload for quite awhile now, and we have had to eliminate positions as the work has been lost. So far, we have not had to go through a Reduction In Force (RIF), but only because we have been able to use Voluntary Separation Incentive Pay (VSIP) or Voluntary Early Retirement Authority (VERA). These options will not be enough to avoid a RIF as our work continues to disappear, and most of the VERA and VSIP eligible people have already moved on.

So our work has been, and continues to disappear at alarming rates. However, not one hour from this building an Air Force Base has put a billion dollars into that base. Our district was awarded almost none of that

workload. Why? It boils down to cultural differences. They do things differently than we do. And we were unable to change how we do business to meet that customer's needs. Who is the customer?

Last year's military customer surveys have us near the bottom of customer care in the United States Army Corps of Engineers. Our military customers have rated us very poorly. We are not delivering the projects the customer wants. We are not responsive to their needs. How many of you know that? Who is the customer?

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is doing billions of dollars in Superfund work in this region, much of it requiring engineering studies and designs. They go to other districts to funnel that work to the Corps, not our district. Why? We have been unwilling to change how we do business to meet their needs. Our engineers could not get along with EPA managers, so they found another organization to contract their workload. Who is the customer? Think about that one for a minute. There are billions of dollars in work from the EPA right here and it is being done by districts in other regions. What does that tell you about our ability to continue working the same way we've been working.

Okay, so that's lost work with the Air Force and the EPA, what about the Army? The Department of the Army, Base Realignment and Closure (DA BRAC) is not happy with our district either. They say we are expensive, not responsive and hinted that they are planning to go to another district to contract out their workload.

Civil works is not immune either. Recon and feasibility reports are usually late and often go over budget. Sure, we may do okay on the high priority/high visibility projects, but most of the others drift along with no active management making sure we meet our schedules, budgets and keep the customer happy. Ask yourself how common it is for our projects to go over budget or blow deadlines. It is the norm rather than the exception, and that doesn't get it done anymore.

The theme is very clear to me and must be to you. If you don't think changes are necessary, you're not paying attention to our customers. The message is clear: **Customers are not satisfied with the service they are getting and are going elsewhere.** Sure we have gotten by so far with VSIPs and VERAs, but soon we will have to start cutting positions, unless we all start working together to make the changes your district leaders and I have agreed, are necessary. We must recapture the lost work by changing our processes to meet the customer's needs and expectations.

We are moving out with our business changes to meet those customer needs and expectations. **This organization is transitioning from product delivery to project delivery.** The entire organization must accept this fact. A project is not just a collection of individual products which are passed from functional division to functional division. The customer sees a building, a levee, or a new housing area at a military installation, not a collection of products. The customer doesn't see the collection of work products (design, real estate, counsel, environmental, regulatory, etc), they see the project itself. They are not concerned with why a project got delayed. The customer doesn't care that a mix-up in communication between branches led to the project budget being all wrong, they only see the cost going over what we said it would.

The only way to transform to a project focused organization is with strong project teams led by a project manager. The manager must have the full support of the organization and the tools to manage. The process we will use to manage the projects to ensure that we are taking care of our customers is the Project Management Business Process (PMBP). We will need tools to support PMBP to make sure it works properly. The Corps has a tool to manage funding, the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS). Even though CEFMS is cumbersome and difficult for us, it will ultimately give us the feedback and control over our budgets that we didn't have before. Taking care of the customer is not always easy with CEFMS, but it is necessary. Who is the customer?

We also have tools to manage the project team and our timelines with the Programs and Project Management Information System (PROMIS) and Microsoft (MS) Project. Those are the tools we have to use today. Yes, there might be better, more user-friendlier, more versatile, more whatever tools if we'd just wait a few months. And I hear it often, if we wait 12-18 months we can have a really good tool but ..... Since I have been in high school, if I waited just a bit more, I could buy a calculator with not only four functions but square root. Or, I could wait even longer and get standard deviation. The point is, tools can get better, later on. We are out of 'laters.' We must implement PMBP now. It is the best tool we have at this moment. We must load projects into PROMIS and MS Project now. PMBP, CEFMS, PROMIS and MS Project may be difficult and there may be better options later on, but right now, this is the only available option. We need to use the best tools available today and that's what we are doing. General Colin Powell said, **"An 80 percent plan excuted well is better than a 100 percent plan excuted late."**

I think you should know some more facts about the PMBP and your district. **The objective of PMBP is to:**

1) Enhance service to our customers;

2) Provide a focal point for interface with customers;

3) Place emphasis on completing projects and programs rather than just individual products or phases, and;

4) Enhance the Army Corps' reputation.

Some people think it is **JUST** adding another layer of management. I have heard this complaint since my first district command and it is wearing thin. If you don't think we need to do a better job of taking care of our customers, go back to the top and read this article again. PMPB is the method. If you're not happy with the way Project Management (PM) has operated in the past, that's okay, because **we are changing how PM used to function.** PMBP makes many changes to the old PM processes. **We need to get over our historical objections and move forward together.**

That's where we are ladies and gentlemen. The question is; **Are you going to jump in and help us make these changes or wait until your branch loses customers and your future is decided for you? §**

ENGINEER INSPECTOR GENERAL (EIG) REPORT

Program and Project Management

Mr. Jerry Savage, CECW-BD

In December 1997, the Chief directed the Engineer Inspector General (EIG) to conduct a systemic inspection to determine the organization's commitment to the goals and objectives of the Program and Project Management Business Process (PMBP) described in Engineer Regulation (ER) 5-1-11, Program and Project Management (PPM).

The Chief approved the EIG Inspection Report on 11 February 1999, with the following comment: ***"This is an outstanding report! The EIG has clearly captured my intent for Project Management. PPM is the process we will use to do our work. "Teamwork" is the Key! I expect all leaders and anyone involved with PPM to read this report. "***

That is a rather strong endorsement from the Chief. And, as the PPM process is the process by which we do all our work, literally, everyone in the organization should read the report to better understand how what they do fits within the PMBP. At the present time, many of us are struggling with interpreting our respective roles under this new process.

ER 5-1-11 is intentionally less directive than previous regulations to allow organizations to develop their business practices based on their unique requirements, while staying within the framework of the Program and Project Management Business Process. Unfortunately, the regulation's flexibility has caused some confusion in the implementation of the PMBP. For organizations that understand the intent of the PMBP, the regulation contains sufficient guidance and direction. Conversely, those organizations that do not understand the PMBP can use the vagueness in the regulation to justify practices that are not consistent with the PMBP. **Organizations practicing inconsistent processes were interpreting the regulation relative to the existing culture without grasping the implications of their actions**. The intent of the regulation was to allow for flexibility of implementation procedures, not to allow room for interpretation of the most basic tenets of the program.

The EIG visited a representative number of offices and made some general observations as to the overall commitment to Program and Project Management Business Process (PMBP). Although there is almost universal acceptance of the PMBP, the real philosophy of the PMBP was, for the most part, not translated into a true application of the process. **The objectives of PMBP will never be consistently achieved without an organization-wide understanding of the process.**

In the organizations that have made the greatest progress towards implementation of the PMBP, the EIG found that the Program and Project Management organization is not viewed as a "stovepipe". There is a true focus on PMBP process, and the entire workforce is educated to the requirements. The emphasis is on teamwork and the entire team is formed early. There is a clear empowerment of the PM and the entire team to get the job done. Commitments are scheduled and kept, and internal assessments are conducted. The Deputy for Programs and Project Management (DPM) is clearly the senior civilian, and Project Review Boards (PRBs) are considered important to the management of all projects and programs. The more successful PRBs include pre-PRB coordination meetings that address all projects; assess Project baselines; and provide for Project Briefings by exception.

The EIG made recommendations on what must be accomplished for the PMBP to be applied consistently throughout USACE. The most significant recommendation addresses the extent of misunderstanding of the PMBP in the Corps. It stresses the need for continued emphasis on educating the organization on the PMBP. Also, it was recommended that additional guidance be developed concerning the roles of program managers and determining how the laboratories should apply the PMBP. Furthermore, issues dealing with the application and support of the PMBP at HQUSACE are to be addressed by a review of policies and procedures to ensure they are consistent with the PMBP. Teams have been formed to address these recommendations and this ongoing process should help all of us to better understand that all programs and

activities in the organization follow a common process under the PMBP. And that ***"Teamwork" is the Key!*** to our success.

Editor's Note: *Due to certain regulatory restrictions on EIG reports, they are internal documents not meant for public distribution.* **§**

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUSINESS PROCESS (PMBP

A District Commander's Open Letter

The doctrine of the Project Management Business Process (PMBP) is best presented in Engineer Regulation (ER) 5-1-11, Program and Project Management, and the Engineer Inspector General (EIG) Report on PMBP. Both of these documents show how processes and organizations are interrelated. The documents explain PMBP by starting with the definition of a "project", introducing all the components (processes and organization) of PMBP and ending with the integration of all the components into the way the Corps will perform all work. This is best expressed by the **eight Imperatives,** both in the ER and the EIG Report.

The primary theme for the USACE Commander's Course: Phase II, must be the Project Management Business Practice (PMBP). By focusing on and teaching the PMBP, we are showing how the traditional activities (products) are integrated into a single life-cycle seamless process. This is represented by the "wheel". We are showing how traditional "stovepipes" are transformed into Project Delivery Teams (PDT). This may be represented by a "rectangle" filled with multi-disciplined people.

The "wheel" is a graphic way to show the paradigm shift from a series on sequential activities to seamless interconnected processes. The "rectangle" is a graphic way to show the paradigm shift from a hierarchical organizational chart to a team of the right folks. Put the "wheel" and the "rectangle" together into a 3-dimentional shape and one gets a cylinder. This "cylinder " can be used to develop all of the principles of PMBP. **§**

STOCKTON'S STATEMENT

Mr. Steve Stockton, CESPD-ET

There is still much uncertainty surrounding how Engineer Regulation (ER) 5-1-11, Program and Project Management, will be implemented relative to the planning function. Commanders clearly have the charge to develop organizational structures that implement the principles of the ER, while preserving the planning capability the Corps needs as we move into the 21st Century. It is unclear whether supplemental guidance will be necessary to clarify the planning/Project Management (PM) interface as it was with Operations/PM.

The following commentary reflects considerable soul searching regarding how to best care for people, implement the principles of the ER, and ensure our collective capabilities for the future. We certainly have incredibly difficult choices and there is no single, magic, clean answer. I agree with many of the observations and assessments provided regarding various organizational models that have been proposed, but I am concerned that some proposals would not ensure the best long-term capability for the Corps and our customers.

When many of us started our careers with the Corps, the Chief of Engineering Division was the senior civilian in each district. Technical quality was the top priority and management was an important, but somewhat lesser consideration. The role of project management has since grown dramatically and is now the center of leadership attention as a key to the Corps long-term success. Although the focus has shifted, it is still extremely important that we maximize the technical capability, which has sustained the Corps through more than two centuries of change. The Chief has made it clear that we will not diminish our technical capability as we implement the management changes.

As technical function chiefs, we have three basic responsibilities:

1) We must develop and provide technically competent people for the various project teams.

2) We must assure that the processes produce quality products. Developing and sustaining institutional knowledge and continuity in the various technical disciplines as well as the unique problems/challenges presented in each geographic area are critical to developing capable people and processes.

3) We must manage the resources necessary for the project teams to be successful. By this, I mean that we are responsible for assuring that the various internal and external resources necessary for a project are qualified, capable and available as needed.

As we define the appropriate role, structure, and location of planning in the aftermath of shifting study management duties to the project managers, we have a

fundamental, difficult choice. **The choice is between fracturing the traditional lead planner role by separating the plan formulation and study management roles, or placing a technical role in project management.** The first choice is problematic because we have generally equated plan formulation with study management and because, from a study manager's perspective, relinquishing the team leader role is difficult. The second choice compromises the technical quality assurance role, creating a major conflict of interest.

In analyzing this dilemma, I focus on a few basic principles:

1) Plan formulation is a technical discipline critical to the timely development of quality products and services, particularly decision documents. Plan formulation is the application of policy. It is the discipline most responsible for ensuring that our products adhere to policies determining the Federal interest so critical in the authorization and appropriation processes. It is also the source or a contributor to most delays associated with HQUSACE policy compliance review. Our lack of focus and emphasis on plan formulation provides a major opportunity to improve both the quality and timeliness of decision documents. Our field Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) emphasis on plan formulation must be improved.

2) The synergy among the key "soft" disciplines (plan formulation, economics, and environmental resources) contributing to pre-authorization decision documents must be preserved. Although engineering support is critical, the collaboration need is generally not as intense, sustained, and iterative as among the soft disciplines, and can be more readily provided by a separate organization.

3) The integrator role of project management must not be compromised by creating a conflict-of-interest inherent in assigning a technical function, plan formulation, to project management. There will be a tendency for project managers to become our internal proponents for the sponsors. This creates a conflict with protecting the Federal interest in project participation. This is accentuated by the widespread, but sometimes inappropriate, view that the sponsor is always our most important customer, not the taxpayer, congress or the administration. We would also diminish, possibly egregiously, independent quality control for the application of formulation policies.

4) Valid career paths must be available to all disciplines, although not necessarily in every location.

Applying these principles to proposals that suggest moving all planning functions into Project Management in total, leads me to the following observations:

1) We will need to have a transition period, possibly painful for some individuals, during which ex-study managers must choose whether they want to become our plan formulation experts or pursue a career in project management. Both are needed. Neither is irreversible. Some personal growth may be needed on the part of some ex-study managers in all parts of our organization.

2) Morale is low among planners, but the sense of hopelessness is due to the desire to keep things as they were. Roles are never static, so clinging to the past is hopeless. The solution is to embrace this change as an opportunity to improve the relevance of planning by taking it to a higher level of competency. Our ability to produce timely, quality decision documents has been and continues to be under scrutiny internally, at the Assitant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), (ASA (CW)), at Congress, and among our customers. **Emphasizing the technical and policy aspects of plan formulation through stronger field in-house competency is key to improving the planning process.** The challenge is to reduce rework and delays due to decision document problems identified during the policy compliance review. Morale may suffer further as we make the transition but planning has a meaningful role and we can, through positive leadership, ensure it is a more satisfying and more valued function and hence career choice. Communication is critical.

3) Shifting the study management responsibilities and careful delineation of plan formulation duties will help reduce many of the problems such as sponsor frustrations, strained internal relationships, and frustration over higher grades.

4) Plan formulators must have access to the sponsor. The ER 5-1-11 does not preclude team member participation in coordination with the sponsor at appropriate times.

5) Plan formulation experts should command the same grades as other technical experts, i.e. routinely GS-11 and 12, and possibly an occasional GS-13. The policy application aspect of the positions should help protect the grades. With proper emphasis and role definition they should remain valued, viable and visible positions. They are too critical to our success with decision documents and our marketing capability to allow otherwise.

6) Planning should continue to develop future project managers. Providing the opportunity for independent, innovative thinking is even more

critical with PM's assuming the study management role and for planning to fulfill its QA/QC role. Unfiltered advice from planning also becomes more critical.

In summary, it seems to me that we must make the case that **maintaining plan formulation as a separate and distinct function will give the Corps (CW, at least) a competitive advantage.** We will have to show that we will be able to strengthen our ability to analyze problems, develop alternatives, evaluate them and recommend a solution. If we can't deliver better plans, faster and cheaper, then we will be irrelevant. We also will not be able to attract new talent to that function.

In order to strengthen our capability in this area, **we must invest in improvements.** Our Research & Development (R&D) items must support improvements to plan formulation techniques. Our training must be revamped and strengthened. We have to look carefully at revising a whole range of position descriptions. We need a marketing plan to convince those inside the Corps/Army that this new approach will really deliver a stronger CW program. We will need an external marketing plan to convince sponsors and our major customer - the taxpayer- that this is a NEW CORPS that can come up with better, faster, cheaper solutions to water resource problems.

All this fits well under the ER's requirements that **functional chiefs "... are responsible for developing and maintaining a professional, technically competent workforce; establishing and maintaining the necessary systems, technical processes and environment to produce quality products..."**

We just have to bite the bullet to commit the resources, starting here in HQ, to fulfill those responsibilities.

Essayons,
STEVE §

THE DESIGN CHARRETTE PROCESS

Mr. Richard Hancock, CEPOA-PM

Design charrettes have been gaining popularity for several years and are quickly becoming the method of choice to kick-start the design process. Despite this growing popularity, there are still many questions and misconceptions about the charrette process. Advocates of the process say things like "charrettes shorten the design schedule", "charrettes keep the design within budget and eliminate lost effort", "charrettes reduce construction cost and time growth", and "charrettes save money and provide a better project which meets all of the customers needs." Detractors of the process say things like "charrettes are another unnecessary meeting;" "Charrettes are too expensive and eat up much of the design budget;" "Charrettes are the latest craze and will be out of vogue in a few years;" and "Charrettes are just another buzzword to describe the things that occur in any successful project."

So what is the truth? What is a charrette? The definition from the U.S. Air Force Project Manager's Guide for Project Definition (the "Red Book") is as follows:

Charrette. An intensive work session, usually at the customer site. It lasts several davs and is attended by the customer, A-E, design agent, representatives from the regulatory agencies, and the Project Management Team. The term comes from the French word for a small-wheeled cart, a "charrette." The usage comes from the days of the Beaux Arts, a Parisian architectural school. When the student's work was due, a cart came through the student community to collect the drawings and take them back to school to be judged. Students, then, like now, were often unfinished. So they got on the cart to finish their designs. They were "on charrette." To this dav. architects working long hours say they are "on charrette".

What is the process? A typical Design Charrette is 5 days long but can run from 4 to 7 days, depending on the complexity of the project. A 5 day charrette will include the following:

- Day One. Project overview, discussion of the goals, agenda and charrette process, ground rules for the charrette (perhaps developing a draft partnering agreement), an analysis of functions, and the Function Analysis System Technique (FAST) with full team participation. The FAST is a Value Engineering tool, which identifies the functional requirements of the project.

- Day Two. Preliminary development of the site floor plans, analysis of the design alternatives, preparation of the cost estimates for the alternatives, selection of the desire alternatives and determine the parameters in the 1391 and the allowable program amount (PA).

- Day Three. Continued development of the design, cost estimate and checks against the PA. Determine the acquisition strategv (IFB,, Design Build, 8A, and specification format), and schedule.

- Dav Four. Continued development of the design and revisions to the plan. Work on the Project Management Plan and the scope of work to compile the design. Prepare an Executive Summary, Partnering Agreement, and group presentation.

- Day Five. Accomplish the executive staff briefing.

The charrette team addresses any questions. The final partnering agreement is distributed for signature. Celebrate success.

It is recommended that a professional facilitator be utilized to help build the charrette team and keep them on track. In addition to being an experienced group discussion leader, the facilitator should be knowledgeable about Value Engineering procedures and techniques.

The products of the charrette will include a partnering agreement, a project management plan, and a design that is somewhere between the 10 percent and the 35 percent completion stage. Since this design was developed by everyone involved in the project (i.e. AE designer, customer, project delivery team, etc.) there is much less likelihood that changes will be required during design. In fact, **one of the important aspects of the charrette process is the command briefing at the end of the charrette.** Everyone on the team develops the design and, when changes are required after the charrette is complete, an agreed upon process in the management plan must be followed to incorporate the changes into the design. Impacts of the change on the project schedule and cost will be discussed and understood before the change is implemented.

The cost to take a project through the charrette process is approximately 2 percent but can be up to 3 percent of the PA, depending on the size and complexity of the project. Many people think that a charrette is just a "meeting" and wonder why it can be so expensive. The actual charrette is not that expensive, but the preparation can be. Site investigations usually must be performed by the design team, analysis of geotechnical data, survey data, code research, and as-built conditions must be investigated. This information is taken into the charrette process to develop the design. When the project is to be designed by an A/E firm, it's normal to negotiate and award a contract for the A/E to participate in the charrette process. **Participation in the charrette process includes developing a questionnaire, gathering design information, participating in the charrette, developing the design and cost estimate, and assisting in developing the scope of work for the remainder of the design contract.** This A/E participation is typically $60K to $100K. Hiring a charrette facilitator, and staff to produce the report is typically $20K to $50K, depending on the length and complexity of the charrette. In house costs to prepare for and participate in the charrette is typically $20K to $50K. A summary of the costs is as follows:

For a charrette on a renovation project that makes use of only in-house staff with no additional technical, AE, or facilitator support, the cost to conduct the charrette can be as low as $50K. For a new project needing investigations for environmental hazards; survey, geotechnical and utilitv svstem analyses; AE design; and a facilitator; the cost can be several hundred thousand dollars to prepare for and conduct the charrette (i.e. up to 3 percent of the PA).

The U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, began conducting design charrettes in Nov 1998 with the combined Army/Air Force Joint Mobility Complex. Since that time, we have conducted 6 design charrettes for the Army program and 13 for the Air Force program. We are currently conducting design charrettes for every MILCON project in the FY98 program. In addition to the design charrette, we also began programming charrettes with the Air Force at the beginning of FY98. **A programming charrette normally lasts one to two days discussing multiple projects, functional analysis, design needs, and the parametric cost estimates.** Cost and function are the main items of concern at these meetings. The intent is to ascertain the end users actual needs, and confirm the amount programmed to meet those needs. These charrettes are far less formal than the design charrettes.

The implementation of the charrette process within the Alaska District has not always been smooth sailing. A list of lessons learned will come out in the future. There are two lessons that should be noted: Do not try to shorten a design charrette to three days unless the project is very basic and straightforward. Five days is typical to fully develop the design with full team input. The other lesson is to **make sure team members are empowered to make decisions affecting the project.** When team members provide their input during the week, only to have their decisions changed during the debriefing or later during the design process, defeats the benefits of the charrette. All team members are important to the charrette process, but **a strong facilitator and cost estimator are critical to conducting a successful design charrettes.**

Data that the Alaska District has compiled concerning design charrettes indicate that lost design effort between April 97 and March 98 amounted to one percent of the PA. Out of 11 projects, 8 were developed with design charrettes. For the period between April 96 and March 97, lost design effort was two percent of the PA. Out of 6 projects, 3 were developed with design charrettes. For the period between April 95 and March 96, lost design effort was five percent of the PA. Out of 8 projects, none had design charrettes.

As we implement more design charrettes, we have seen a decrease in lost effort each year. The lost effort that did occur was closely monitored by the charrette tracking process and agreed too by all concerned. Although figures are not currently available, we feel that a similar trend will be seen during the construction phase of contracts which had a design charrette. **The Alaska District and our Army and Air**

Force customers feel that the charrette process has been of great benefit and we look forward to continued success with this process on future projects.

If you have questions or comments concerning design or programming charrettes; or would like additional information, please contact Mr. Richard Hancock at Richard.a.Hancock@,poa02.usace.army.mil. **§**

REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF FY 2002 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY (MCA) PROJECTS

Mr. George Hayes, CEMP-MA

In early Dec 98 the Office of the Chief of Staff for Installation Management (OACSIM) released guidance to the Army's Major Commands (MACOM) on submitting their respective proposed FY 2002 MCA programs. The guidance directed that the MACOM were to identify their FY 2002 MCA program by the end of Jan 99 and to have the completed DD Forms 1391 at HQDA by the beginning of Apr 99. The HQDA Project Review Boards (PRB) currently are planned for the last two weeks in May 99.

It is important for USACE to do a thorough and consistent review of the DD Form 1391 as part of the USACE certification of "designability." Frequent oversights were found in the proper scoping and costing of a project. The submitted DD Forms 1391 must include the certification by USACE. The responsibility to review and certify proposed MCA projects is contained in AR 415-15, Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution.

USACE occasionally has been criticized by some of the PRB members for being lax in certain aspects of the certification. **The certification needs to assure that, among others things, the scope is consistent with current design guidance; complies with standard/definitive designs; uses reasonable unit costs; uses consistent unit costs for similar facilities; and does not include work that is not MILCON fundable.** Use the "comments" option in the 1391 Processor to highlight issues that need to be addressed, whether they are major "show stoppers" in need of correction prior to the Army's PRB or minor points that could be resolved subsequent to the PRB.

Preferably, all recommended changes should be incorporated into the forms by the installation prior to the Army's PRB. By now, the installations and/or MACOMs have begun requesting certification. With a little extra attention, **we can improve the quality of the DD Forms 1391 and improve the Army's chances of successful program execution. §**

SUPPORT TO THE ARMY: WEB-ENABLING THE PROGRAMMING, ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTION (PAX) SYSTEM

Mr. Michael Rice, CEMP-MC

ORIGINATOR AND SERVICE PROPONENTS. HQUSACE, Directorate of Military Programs, Programs Management Division, Programs Branch, (CEMP-MC), Michael Rice, 20 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington DC 20314-1000, (202) 761-8908, FAX (202) 761-0763.

CUSTOMERS. Congress; Department of Defense (DoD) agencies; Army, US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to include [HQUSACE, Divisions, Districts, Field Operation Agencies (FOAs)]; Major Commands (MACOMs); Major Support Centers (MSCs); installation Department of Public Works (DPW); and the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (OACSIM).

BACKGROUND. The web-enabled PAX will give users a modern look and the capability to access its applications using browser technology without changing any of the existing functionality or capabilities of its current applications. CEMP-MC is utilizing Web-enabling technology such as the use of web browsers, fire walls, JavaScript, CACTUS, Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML), VM: Webserver (Office Vision, Gateway, etc), WebFOCUS, Web390, JAVA, etc.

CURRENT STATUS. This web-enabled PAX utilizing full TCP/IP access was released to all PAX users on 31 Mar 99. Initial user reaction is excellent. Users will be afforded:

1) Access to the systems through web browsers.

2) Current functionality of the systems which has not changed.

3) A modern, new appearance of the current applications.

4) A modern, new way of using the systems.

5) Use of a TN3270 environment for executing full screen applications which will also be used by developers and users to develop and test code. It will also be used as a contingency backup access to PAX if a problem with the Internet arises.

USER REQUIREMENTS. PAX users will need: a PC with Windows 95 (or greater), an Internet connection, Internet Explorer 4.0 (or greater) with Service Pack 1.0 or, Netscape 4.07 (or greater), and an understanding of how to use windows software with a mouse. In addition, TN3270 users will need a software package such as QWS3270 (shareware) or equivalent software to execute the environment.

FUTURE PLANS. A feasibility study of the DD 1391 Processor will be conducted to include:

1) CEMP-MC is investigating Tri-Service usage of PAX. A demonstration has been conducted for the Navy and Air Force with favorable reactions.

2) The capability for loading digitized images (photographs, site plans, etc) into the Processor System with links to the appropriate DD1391 form.

3) The capability to view photographs/site plans.

4) The capability to archive photographs/site plans with approved/enacted DD1391 forms.

5) The final product of the PAX Web-Enabling efforts will be a PAX system that incorporates modern technology allowing PAX users to access PAX applications using multiple Browser technology (Internet Explorer, Netscape.

WEBPAX GROUP E-MAIL. A group e-mail list exists to provide you with news, information and instructions. To get subscribed to the WEBPAX GROUP list:

1) Send a plain E-Mail to:

   webpax-subscribe@egroups.com

2) Or, visit the web page at:

   http://www.egroups.com/list/webpax/

3) Or, send an E-Mail to Mr. Bill Crambo at:

   bill.crambo@usace.army.mil

4) Simply request to be added to the WebPAX group list.

POINTS OF CONTACT. Additional information concerning the individuals responsible for the PAX system and the PAX system is as follows.

1) Mr. Michael Rice, CEMP-MC, (202) 761-8908, DSN 763-8908, FAX (202) 761-0763, PAX Proponent Office, PAX Program Manager and Contracting Officer's Representative,

   E-Mail: mike.rice@usace.army.mil

2) Mr. John (Garry) Runyans, CEHNC-ED-ES-A, (256) 895-1817, DSN 760-1817, 1391 Processor (PC-COST, ECONPACK), Assigned Responsible Agency (ARA), 1391 Processor System Administrator,

   E-Mail: john.g.runyans@hnd01.usace.army.mil

3) Mr. William Crambo, CEMP-MC, (202) 761-8900, DSN 763-8900, CAPCES Proponent Office, CAPCES System Administrator,

   E-Mail: william.crambo@usace.army.mil

4) Mr. Richard Dixon, CEMP-MC, (202) 761-8902, DSN 763-8902, DIRNET Proponent Office, DIRNET System Administrator

   E-Mail: richard.dixon@usace.army.mil

5) Mr. Robert Wong, CEMP-EE, (202) 761-1241, DSN 763-1241, PC-COST System Administrator,

   E-Mail: robert.wong@usace.army.mil

6) Ms. Barbara Hempstead, McClendon Automation Corp, Vice President of Technical Operations, (703) 263-0490, Ext 15, DSN 763-8888, CAPCES Maintenance Project Manager,

   E-Mail: hotline@mcclendonautomation.com

7) Mr. Chris Anderson, Electronic Data Corporation, Director of PAX Technical Operations, (703) 733-3260

   E-Mail: pax-hotline@eds.com

8) **PAX Hotline**: (800) 873-7299, (703) 733-3213

   E-Mail: pax-hotline@eds.com

9) **DD Form 1391 Processor Hotline**: USACOE Huntsville Center, (256) 895-1838, DSN 760-1838,

   E-Mail: paxspt-huntsville@hnd01.usace.army.mil

10) **CAPCES Hotline**: McClendon Automation Corporation, (703) 263-0490, Ext 2, DSN 763-8888

    E-MAIL: hotline@mcclendonautomation.com

11) **PAX Billing Hotline**: Mr. Harold Miles, Advanced Technology Systems, (202) 761-8909, Senior Systems Analyst,

    E-Mail: harold.miles@usace.army.mil §

APPLICATIONS SYSTEM	PROPONENT AGENCY	SUPPORTING AGENCY
PAX	Directorate of Military Programs Programs Branch (CEMP-MC) Michael Rice (202) 761-8908 DSN 763-8908	Electronic Data Systems Chris Anderson (703) 733-3260
1391 PROCESSOR	Directorate of Military Programs Programs Branch (CEMP-MC) Michael Rice (202) 761-8908 DSN 763-8908	US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC-ED-ES-A) Garry Runyans (256) 895-1817 DSN 760-1817
CAPCES	Directorate of Military Programs Programs Branch (CEMP-MC) William Crambo (202) 761-8900 DSN 763-8900	McClendon Automation Corporation Barbara Hempstead (703) 263-0490 Ext 15 DSN 763-8888
DIRNET	Directorate of Military Programs Programs Branch (CEMP-MC) Richard Dixon (202) 761-8902 DSN 763-8902	McClendon Automation Corporation Barbara Hempstead (703) 263-0490 Ext 15 DSN 763-8888
ECONPACK	Directorate of Military Programs Programs Branch (CEMP-MC) Michael Rice (202) 761-8908 DSN 763-8908	US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC-ED-ES-A) Garry Runyans (256) 895-1817 DSN 760-1817
PC-COST	Directorate of Military Programs Cost Engineering and Programs Formulation Branch (CEMP-EE) Robert Wong (202) 761-1241 DSN 763-1241	US Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville (CEHNC-ED-ES-A) Garry Runyans (256) 895-1817 DSN 760-1817

YOU MAY CONTRIBUTE ARTICLES OR PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR ARTICLES TO EITHER:

MR. EDWARD P. RACHT, CEMP-MP, 202-761-8816
OR MR. BRAD PRICE, CECW-BD, 202-761-1116.

Programs Management News is an unofficial publication published in accordance with AR 25-30, The Army Integrated Publishing and Printing Program. It is published by the HQ, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Directorates of Civil Works & Military Programs, Programs Management Divisions, 20 Massachusettes Ave., NW, Washington D.C., 20314-1000. §

CONTRIBUTORS

MR. STEVE BROWNING ..... CEMP-M
MR. FRED CAVER ..... CECW-B
MR. RICHARD HANCOCK ..... CEPOA-PM
MR. GEORGE HAYES ..... CEMP-MA
MR. MICHAEL RICE ..... CEMP-MC
MR. JERRY SAVAGE ..... CECW-BD
MR. STEVE STOCKTON ..... CESPD-ET